

**Remarks/Arguments:**

This is a reply to the office action of November 7, in which claims 15 - 16 were allowed. Claim 8, and the claims which depend from it, were rejected because of insufficient antecedent basis for “the said openings” in the next to last line. The rejection was well taken.

Claim 8 has been amended to comply with the requirement for adequate basis; no new matter has been introduced.

Withdrawn claims 1 - 7 have been canceled with prejudice to the filing of a divisional application containing those claims.

We believe that the claims as amended are now in proper form and are patentable over the prior art of record.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles Fallow/

---

Charles W. Fallow  
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.  
10 Post Office Road - Suite 100  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

March 9, 2009